

REMARKS

The present invention is directed to organic light-emitting devices with non-planar elements on a second substrate. Claims 28-29 are newly added. Thus, claims 1-3 and 21-29 are pending.

Following the suggested practice of MPEP § 706.07(h), this submission includes the amendments and arguments made in Applicants' Response to Final Office Action dated November 4, 2004. Applicants note that the Response was not entered because the case was after final. Now that an RCE has been filed, Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered.

Discussion of Final Office Action

In a final office action dated August 10, 2004, the Office rejected claims 1-3 and 21-27. Claims 2, 3, and 25 were objected to for typographical informalities.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1 and 23 have been amended to more particularly describe the second substrate as having a non-planar form because it includes a plurality of non-planar elements. Support for this amendment can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 9, lines 24-25 and in Figure 2B depicting a lens array. The claims have also been amended to recite at least one OLED in order to more particularly describe one embodiment as depicted Figure 2B.

The preambles of claims 2 and 3 have been amended to conform to the preamble of claim 1, from which claims 2 and 3 depend.

Claims 2 and 24 have been amended to refer to the non-planar element recited in amended claims 1 and 23, from which these claims depend. Support for this amendment can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 7, lines 20-25.

Claims 25 and 27 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

New claims 28 and 29 describe one embodiment of the invention where an OLED is positioned at the approximate center of curvature of a spherical non-planar element. Support for this amendment can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 9, lines 12-20.

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 3, and 25 were objected to for informalities. The informalities have been corrected according to the Examiner's suggestions.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 21, and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lebby et al. (EP 0 777 276 A2).

In order for a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every element of the claim in exactly the same way. *See* MPEP § 2131.

Claims 1 and 23

Independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to more particularly describe the second substrate as having a non-planar form because it includes a plurality of non-planar elements. As discussed in the interview on October 21, 2004, Lebby does not teach or suggest a second substrate including a plurality of non-planar elements.

Lebby discloses an array of light emitting devices (20) formed on a transparent substrate (18) with a lens (33) mounted to the substrate. Applicants maintain that one of skill in the art would not consider the lens (33) of the Lebby device to constitute a second transparent substrate. However, assuming *arguendo* that the lens of Lebby can be considered a second substrate, that substrate is a single non-planar lens attached to the first substrate. Even if multiple Lebby "substrates" (lenses) were attached to a first substrate, there would still not be a unitary second substrate including a plurality of non-planar elements, where the second substrate is attached to a first substrate. In contrast to Lebby, the present claims as amended describe a second substrate including a plurality of non-planar elements. The plurality of features on a second substrate, unlike the prior art, allows for the simultaneous application of many non-planar elements, *e.g.* lenses, to a first substrate upon which one or more OLEDs has been fabricated.

In view of foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 24

Claims 2 and 24 have been amended to refer to the non-planar element, as recited in amended claims 1 and 23. Claims 2 and 24 are not anticipated by Lebby for the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 23, from which these claims depend.

Claims 3 and 25

Claims 3 and 25 are not anticipated by Lebby for the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 23, from which these claims depend.

Claims 21 and 26

Claims 21 and 26 are not anticipated by Lebby for the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 23, from which these claims depend.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 22 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Lebby.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations, there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the reference teachings, and a reasonable expectation of success. MPEP § 2143.

Claims 22 and 27

Claims 22 and 27 are not rendered obvious by Lebby because, as discussed in the interview on October 21, 2004, Lebby does not teach or suggest a second substrate including a plurality of non-planar elements. See claims 1 and 23 above. Accordingly, claims 22 and 27 are not rendered obvious for the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 23, from which these claims depend.

Interview Summary

The applicants thank the examiner for the courtesy extended during an interview on October 21, 2004. The Applicants record of the interview as required by MPEP § 713.04 is as follows:

- (A) No exhibit or demonstration was used.
- (B) Claims 1, 28, and 29 were specifically discussed.
- (C) The following art was discussed:
Lebby et al. (EP 0 777 276 A2)

- (D) Applicants proposed amending claim 1 to recite that the second transparent substrate has a non-planar form because it includes a plurality of non-planar elements.
- (E) Applicants argued that amended claim 1 overcomes Lebby because Lebby does not teach or suggest a second substrate having a non-planar form because it includes a plurality of non-planar elements. Applicants argued that one of skill in the art would not consider the lens (33) of the Lebby device to constitute a second transparent substrate. Even if the lens (33) can be considered a second substrate, the Applicants and Examiner agreed that Lebby only discloses a single non-planar lens attached to the first substrate. In order to expedite allowance, Applicants proposed amending claim 1 to recite a second substrate including a plurality of non-planar elements. A second substrate including a plurality of non-planar elements as depicted in Fig. 2B, unlike the prior art, allows for the simultaneous application of many non-planar elements, *e.g.* lenses, to a first substrate upon which one or more OLEDs has been fabricated.

The Applicants also proposed adding new dependent claims wherein an OLED is positioned at the approximate center of curvature of a lens. The Examiner did not foresee any problems with the new claims.


- (F) No other pertinent matters were discussed.
- (G) The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment to claim 1 overcomes Lebby.
- (H) The interview was not conducted via e-mail.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 4, 2005



Dana Ziker
Reg. No. 54,567

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, NW
Washington D.C. 20005
Direct Dial: (202)-220-4215
Fax: (202)-220-4201